IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:-

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.PADMANABHAN NAIR

FRIDAY, THE 16TH MARCH 2007 / 25TH PHALGUNA 1928

W.P.(C).No.8915 of 2007(J)

PETITIONERS:-
---

1. N.KRISHNAN, T.C.26/2003, 204, PULIMOOD, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 1.

2. K.RAMACHANDRAN, T.C.25/259, PULIMOOD, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 1.

3. K.PARAMESWARAN PILLAI, T.C.26/1616, PULIMOOD, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 1.

4. APPUKKUTTAN NAIR, T.C.25/256, PULIMOOD, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

5. SALIM, T.C.25/254, PULIMOOD, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

6. GURUNADHAN, T.C.25/255, PULIMOOD, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

7. MUJEEB RAHMAN, T.C.25/256, PULIMOOD, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 1.

8. JAVAHAR, T.C.25/202, PULIMOOD, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

9. ABUBACKER, T.C.25/197/1, PULIMOOD, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 1.

10. AJITHA KUMARI S., T.C.25/187, PULIMOOD, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 1.

11. NAJEEB, T.C.25/257, PULIMOOD, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-1.

BY ADV. SMT.M.HEMALATHA
SRI.B.SATHIQ

RESPONDENTS:-
---

1. DEPUTY COLLECTOR (L.A.), COLLECTORATE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. TRIVANDRUM DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, REPRESENTED BY THE CHAIRMAN.

3. DISTRICT COLLECTOR, VANCHIYOOR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

R1 & R3 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.L.G.SURESH BABU.
R2 BY STANDING COUNSEL SRI.K.A.JALEEL.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 16/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:-

K.Padmanabhan Nair,J.

W.P.(C).No.8915 of 2007-J

Dated, this the 16th day of March, 2007

JUDGMENT

The grievance raised by the petitioners is that all of a sudden they were directed to vacate from the shop rooms in which they are doing business without giving any notice.

2. The Standing Counsel appearing for the Trivandrum Development Authority (TRIDA) submits that the statement is not true and all the occupants including tenants were given notice as early as on 20.6.2006, that is to say at least nine months earlier. It is submitted that the only attempt of the petitioners is to protract the proceedings.

3. A reading of the averments in the writ petition itself shows that these petitioners were aware of the acquisition proceedings. I do not find any substance or merit in the contention raised by the petitioners. But, considering the facts and circumstances, the petitioners are given time till 5.00 P.M. on 23.03.2007 to vacate the premises.

In the result, the writ petition is dismissed. The petitioners are given time till 5.00 P.M. on 23.03.2007 to remove the articles and vacate the premises.

K.Padmanabhan Nair
Judge

vku/-